Entered on Docket March 28, 2007 GLORIA L. FRANKLIN, CLERK

GLORIA L. FRANKLIN, CLERK
U.S BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 8 9 In re 10 THE LEGACY ESTATE GROUP, No. 05-14659 Debtor(s). 11 12 OFFICIAL CREDITORS COMMITTEE, 13 14 Plaintiff(s), 15 A.P. No. 06-1173 v. 16 JOHN M. BRYAN, et al., 17 Defendant(s). 18 19 Memorandum re Motion to Certify Case to District Court for Jury Trial 20 Plaintiff originally demanded a jury trial in this adversary proceeding, but withdrew its demand. Three 21 defendants have asked the court to transfer the case to district court for jury trial, even though at least two of 22 them, John M. Bryan and the J. M. Bryan Family Trust, have filed proofs of claim. The filing of a proof of 23 claim waives the right to a jury. Granfinanciera, S.A. v. Nordberg, 492 U.S. 33, 59 n.14, 109 S.Ct. 2782, 24 106 L.Ed.2d 26 (1989). 25 Contrary to defendants' arguments, Rule 38(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure does not bar 26

4 5 6

7

8 10

12 13

11

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26

the withdrawal of a jury demand by plaintiff where the defendant did not rely on the demand. Fuller v. City of Oakland, 47 F.3d 1522, 1531 (9th Cir. 1995); White v. McGinnis, 903 F.2d 699, 701 (9th Cir. 1990); Reid Bros. Logging Co. v. Kitchikan Pulp Co., 699 F.2d 1292, 1304 (9th Cir. 1983). Moreover, a party has no standing to object to waiver of a right by another party unless it is aggrieved by the waiver. Since Bryan and the J. M. Bryan Family Trust have waived the right to a jury, they have no standing to object to plaintiff's waiver of its right to a jury trial.

The rights of the third defendant, the John M. and Florence E. Bryan Trust, are more problematical. This defendant has not filed a claim in its own name. However, it appears that its alter ego may have filed a proof of claim or that it is close enough in identity to be bound by the jury waiver of other entities. Resolution of this matter requires an evidentiary hearing and further briefing.

For the foregoing reasons, the motion will be denied with prejudice as to defendants John M. Bryan and the J. M. Bryan Family Trust. As to the John M. and Florence E. Bryan Trust, the parties shall arrange an evidentiary hearing and submit supplemental briefs. In the event that the court determines that this defendant is entitled to a jury trial, the claims against it will be severed and only those severed claims will be transferred to the district court; the case will proceed in this court as to defendants who have waived their right to a jury.

Counsel for plaintiff shall submit an appropriate form of order.

Dated: March 28, 2007

Alan Jaroslovsk

U.S. Bankruptcy Judge

United States District Court

For the Northern District of California

On May 24, 2007, defendants and cross-claimants John M. Bryan, John M. and Florence E. Bryan Trust, and J.M. Family Trust, filed with the bankruptcy court a motion to withdraw the reference to the bankruptcy court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(d) and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure ("FRBP") 5011. On June 6, 2007, the bankruptcy court transmitted the motion to this court pursuant to Rule 5011. Upon transferring the motion, the bankruptcy court did not provide any recommendation regarding whether its reference should be withdrawn.

Because the bankruptcy court is more familiar with the underlying chapter 11 bankruptcy case filed in November 2005, and with the adversary case for which movants seek withdrawal of the reference, pursuant to Bankruptcy L.R. 5011-2(b), the court refers the instant motion to the bankruptcy court for a report and recommendation regarding whether the reference should be withdrawn under 28 U.S.C. § 157(d), including but not limited to whether the movant's right to a jury trial constitutes cause for withdrawal of the reference. Once the bankruptcy court has submitted to this court its recommendation regarding whether withdrawal of reference should occur, this court will set a further briefing schedule, if necessary, and issue a final order on the motion pursuant to Rule 5011.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 25, 2007

United States District Judge

Order transmitted to the Honorable Alan Jaroslovsky

Order transmitted to the Frontiable Flam advantage

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

#### FOR THE

### NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE LEGACY ESTATE GROUP, LLC,

Debtor.

Case Number: CV07-02943 PJH

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

That on June 26, 2007, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.

USBC Manager-Santa Rosa U.S. Bankruptcy Court 99 South E Street Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Alan Jaroslovsky **USBC** Northern District of California Santa Rosa Division 99 South E Street Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Devinder Sidhu P.O. Box 401 3022 St. Helena Highway North St. Helena, CA 94574

Kulwinder S. Sidhu P.O. Box 401 St. Helena, CA 94574

Dated: June 26, 2007

Mill Hu Richard W. Wieking, Clerk

By: Nichole Heuerman, Deputy Clerk

Entered on Docket
June 28, 2007
GLORIA L. FRANKLIN, CLERK
U.S BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	In re
10	THE LEGACY ESTATE GROUP, No. C 07-2943 PJH
11	Debtor(s). /
12	OFFICIAL CREDITORS COMMITTEE,
13	
14	Plaintiff(s), Bktcy. No. 05-14659
15	v. A.P. No. 06-1173
16	JOHN M. BRYAN, et al.,
17	Defendant(s).
18	
19	Bankruptcy Judge's Report and Recommendation Regarding Withdrawal of Reference
20	Pursuant to the order of the District Court of June 25, 2007, the undersigned bankruptcy judge
21	recommends that the District Court not withdraw the reference in this case for the following reasons:
22	1. The issues in this case are well within the ordinary experience and expertise of the bankruptcy
23	court.
24 25	2. This case has been litigated in bankruptcy court for over seven months during which time the court
26	has already made several key rulings. These include dismissing a cross-claim, denying a motion to transfer the
JU	

case to district court, and striking a jury demand.

- 3. Defendants John M. Bryan and the J. M. Bryan Family Trust have filed proofs of claim in the bankruptcy case. Thus, the underlying dispute is whether these defendants owe the bankruptcy estate money or whether the estate owes them money. Resolution of such disputes is a core purpose of the bankruptcy court both historically and pursuant to 28 U.S.C § 157(b)(2)(B) and § 157(b)(2)(C). The filing of a proof of claim waives the right to a jury. *Granfinanciera*, *S.A. v. Nordberg*, 492 U.S. 33, 59 n.14, 109 S.Ct. 2782, 106 L.Ed.2d 26 (1989).
- 4. One defendant, the John M. and Florence E. Bryan Trust, has not filed a proof of claim. The issue is still pending here as to whether it is bound by the proofs of claim filed by the other two defendants, all of whom are related. Even if the court determines that this remaining defendant is entitled to a jury trial, the court suspects that principles of issue preclusion may make that litigation relatively simple once this court has adjudicated the rights of the other two defendants.

WHEREFORE, the undersigned bankruptcy judge recommends that the reference not be withdrawn.

The undersigned also expresses his appreciation to the District Court for an opportunity to comment on this matter. In some cases, litigants use a motion to withdraw the reference for improper purposes, including a desire to delay litigation or make it more expensive for a bankruptcy estate with limited assets to prosecute. Also, in some instances motions to withdraw the reference are filed in an attempt to forum shop when the moving party becomes unhappy with bankruptcy court rulings.

Dated: June 28, 2007

Alan Jaroslovsky U.S. Bankruptcy Judge

1	CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
2	
3	
4	The undersigned deputy clerk of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of California
5	hereby certifies that a copy of the attached document was mailed to all parties listed below as required by the
6	Bankruptcy Code and Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure.
7	
8	Dated: August 8, 2007  Dan Sondheim Deputy Court Clerk
9	
10	
11	Phyllis J. Hamilton United States District Judge United States District Court United States Courthouse 450 Golden Gate Ave. P. O. Box 36060
12	
13	
14	San Francisco, CA 94102-3489
15	United States District Court United States Courthouse 450 Golden Gate Ave. P. O. Box 36060 San Francisco, CA 94102-3489
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
<ul><li>23</li><li>24</li></ul>	
25	
26	
27	
28	
•	

United States District Court

For the Northern District of California

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

On May 24, 2007, defendants and movants John M. Bryan ("Bryan"), John M. and Florence E. Bryan Trust ("JFB Trust"), and J.M. Bryan Family Trust ("JMB Trust"), filed with the bankruptcy court a motion to withdraw the bankruptcy court's reference, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(d) and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure ("FRBP") 5011. On June 6, 2007, the bankruptcy court transmitted the motion to this court pursuant to Rule 5011. On June 29, 2007, the bankruptcy court submitted to this court a report and recommendation, in which the bankruptcy court recommended that this court deny the motion to withdraw the reference. Subsequently, the parties briefed the motion before this court.

Plaintiff, the official committee of unsecured creditors of the debtor Legacy Estate Group, LLC ("committee"), 05-14659 AJ, filed the adversary proceeding, 06-1173 AJ, giving rise to the instant motion, against a number of defendants/creditors, including Bryan, the JMB Trust, and the JFB Trust, to recover estate property and damages. The first amended complaint ("FAC") includes twenty claims, most of which seek relief under the Bankruptcy Code, but a few which seek relief under state law as well.

Movants seek withdrawal of the reference to the bankruptcy court based on the JFB Trust's right to a jury trial. The United States Supreme Court has held that the Seventh Amendment entitles a person who has not submitted a claim against a bankruptcy estate to a jury trial when sued by a bankruptcy trustee seeking monetary relief, even in core proceedings under the Bankruptcy Code, such as fraudulent or preferential transfer actions. Granfinanciera, S.A. v. Nordberg, 492 U.S. 33, 40 n.3, 50 (1989) (fraudulent transfer case); Langenkamp v. Culp, 498 U.S. 42, 44 (1990) (preferential transfer case). Unless all parties consent and the district court designates the bankruptcy court to do so, the bankruptcy court may not conduct the jury trial. See § 157(e). However, a creditor waives the jury trial right by filing a proof of claim in the bankruptcy case. See Granfinanciera, 492 U.S. at 40; Langenkamp, 498 U.S. at 44.

The current motion appears to have been motivated by movants' dissatisfaction with related rulings by the bankruptcy court. There is no dispute that Bryan and the JMB Trust

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

filed proofs of claims in the bankruptcy case. On March 28, 2007, the bankruptcy court noted that was the case, and on June 27, 2007, struck Bryan and the JMB Trust's demands for jury trial. Similarly, there is also no dispute that the JFB Trust did not file a proof of claim. The dispute that has not been resolved, though, and that appeared to have been imminent at the time movants filed the motion before this court, concerns whether or not Bryan and the JMB Trust constituted alter egos for the JFB Trust, such that the filing of Bryan's and the JMB Trust's proofs of claims waived the JFB Trust's jury trial right. In fact, in its March 28, 2007 order, the bankruptcy court granted the parties leave to conduct discovery on the issue, ordered the parties to submit supplemental briefs, and indicated that it would hold an evidentiary hearing on the issue. However, given the instant motion to withdraw its reference, the bankruptcy court did not resolve the issue.

Because that issue is central to this court's decision on the motion to withdraw the reference, the court STAYS the instant motion pending resolution of the issue by the bankruptcy court. The court notes that the bankruptcy court retains jurisdiction to decide the issue in spite of the fact that the current motion to withdraw was filed. See Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 5011(c) (noting that motion to withdraw reference does not stay proceedings before bankruptcy judge "except that the bankruptcy judge may stay, on such terms and conditions as are proper, proceedings pending disposition of the motion"). Because of the size and complexity of the Chapter 11 bankruptcy case, the bankruptcy court's familiarity with the case in general and with the very specific issue here, and the impact on the bankruptcy estate, this issue is more appropriately determined by the bankruptcy court. To the extent that the bankruptcy court decides that the JFB Trust does indeed constitute an alter ego of Bryan and/or the JMB Trust, then JFB Trust, in addition to Bryan and JMB Trust, will all have waived their jury trial right and the instant motion will be mooted. However, to the extent the bankruptcy court determines otherwise, then this court will rule on the motion to withdraw reference.

Accordingly, the court STAYS this motion and case pending the bankruptcy court's

resolution of the above issue. The parties are ORDERED to advise this court immediately upon the bankruptcy court's ruling on the issue.

The clerk shall administratively close this case. The closure has no legal effect; it is purely a statistical matter. The case will be reopened, the stay vacated, and further order issued upon notification by the parties in accordance with the conditions set forth above.

### IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 9\_, 2007

United States District Judge

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

### FOR THE

### NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE LEGACY ESTATE GROUP,

Debtor.

Case Number: CV07-02943 PJH

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

That on August 9, 2007, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.

USBC Manager-Santa Rosa U.S. Bankruptcy Court 99 South E Street Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Alan Jaroslovsky **USBC** Northern District of California Santa Rosa Division 99 South E Street Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Devinder Sidhu P.O. Box 401 3022 St. Helena Highway North St. Helena, CA 94574

Kulwinder S. Sidhu P.O. Box 401 St. Helena, CA 94574

Dated: August 9, 2007

Milli Hu

Richard W. Wieking, Clerk By: Nichole Heuerman, Deputy Clerk